

3-14-1994

University of Northern Iowa Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes, March 14, 1994

University of Northern Iowa. Faculty Senate.

Let us know how access to this document benefits you

Copyright ©1994 Faculty Senate, University of Northern Iowa

Follow this and additional works at: https://scholarworks.uni.edu/facsenate_documents



Part of the [Higher Education Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

University of Northern Iowa. Faculty Senate., "University of Northern Iowa Faculty Senate Meeting Minutes, March 14, 1994" (1994). *Documents - Faculty Senate*. 740.

https://scholarworks.uni.edu/facsenate_documents/740

This Minutes is brought to you for free and open access by the Faculty Senate at UNI ScholarWorks. It has been accepted for inclusion in Documents - Faculty Senate by an authorized administrator of UNI ScholarWorks. For more information, please contact scholarworks@uni.edu.

FACULTY SENATE
MARCH 14, 1994
1474

ANNOUNCEMENTS

1. Call for Press Identification and Introduction of Guests.
2. Remarks from Provost Marlin.
3. Announcements from Chair Lounsberry.

CALENDAR

4. 536 Request from Myra Boots that the Senate conduct an informal discussion concerning faculty and student adherence to examination week responsibilities for both groups. (Appendix A)

It was moved and seconded to docket in regular order for the Senate meeting March 28. Motion carried. (Docket #468.)
5. 537 Motion from Senators Martin, Amend, Baum, and Brown that the University Faculty Senate form an ad hoc committee charged with examining issues related to the enhancement and maintenance of quality in the curriculum. (Appendix B)

It was moved and seconded to docket in regular order for the Senate meeting March 28. Motion carried. (Docket #469.)
6. 538 The ad hoc Committee on Exam Reform, appointed by the Senate Chair and consisting of Senators Haack, Kueter, Primrose, and V.P. Richter, offered the following statement to the Senate for its consideration and adoption as policy: "If regular course examinations are to be scheduled at a time other than when a class normally meets, the time and day of such examinations must be listed in the schedule of classes." (Appendix C)

It was moved and seconded to docket in regular order for the Senate meeting March 28. Motion carried. (Docket #470.)

REPORTS

7. Report from the Ad Hoc Committee on Five-Year Evaluations of President Curris and Provost Marlin, by Professors Robert Kramer and Carmen Montecinos.

Pertaining to the evaluation instrument for President Curris, motion was made and seconded to adopt the evaluation instrument for President Curris as indicated in Appendix D of the February 28 Faculty Senate minutes. During the lengthy discussion which followed, several amendments were made to the evaluation instrument. Motion was made and seconded to approve the evaluation instrument for President Curris as amended, and motion carried. Pertaining to the evaluation instrument for Provost Marlin (Appendix D), motion was made to approve the evaluation instrument for Provost Marlin with the same amendments as were made on the evaluation instrument for President Curris. Motion carried. In the discussion which followed, additional amendments were made to the evaluation instrument for Provost Marlin. Motion was made and seconded to approve the evaluation instrument for Provost Marlin as amended. Motion carried.

The Faculty Senate was called to order at 3:31 p.m. in the Board Room of Gilchrist Hall, by Chairperson Lounsberry.

Present: Edward Amend, Diane Baum, Leander Brown, John Butler, Phyllis Conklin, Kay Davis, Ken DeNault, Sherry Gable, Reginald Green, Joel Haack, Clifford Highnam, Randall Krieg, Roger Kueter, Barbara Lounsberry, Kate Martin, Dean Primrose, Surendar Yadava, Myra Boots, ex-officio.

Absent: Ron Roberts, Mahmood Yousefi

ANNOUNCEMENTS

1. Chair Lounsberry welcomed Professors Carmen Montecinos and Robert Kramer, Registrar Philip Patton, a representative from the Northern Iowan, representatives from Student Government, and student observers.

2. Remarks from Provost Marlin.

Reporting on legislative matters, Provost Marlin stated the House passed the appropriation recommendations from the House Education Appropriations Subcommittee; this reduces appropriations recommended by the Governor by approximately one-third. She stated the Senate may act this week. There has been no legislative action taken yet on the salary or bonding bills.

The Board of Regents would be meeting Wednesday, March 16 in Sioux City. The agenda includes a report on Academic Program Review. The Board office has indicated the need for better utilization of student outcome assessments in program review, and for focusing recommendations on improvement of programs rather than on the use or need for more resources.

Provost Marlin stated 179 proposals had been received for the Faculty Computer Competition Awards and, based on the college recommendations, she was able to fund 114; however, she stated this was the first year that every faculty member who requested a computer will receive one, although, in certain cases, a faculty member may not receive his or her first choice, but a reallocated machine. She stated this was a significant accomplishment in the area of faculty computer technology.

Provost Marlin announced the Center for Enhancement of Teaching will present a series of workshops on effective teaching April 9. She thanked faculty members who are participating in this workshop as facilitators, and encouraged all faculty to take advantage of this opportunity.

In conclusion, Provost Marlin announced that the College of Education had been awarded a \$1 million grant to work with schools in Slovakia. She congratulated Professor Jeanne Steele and Dean Thomas Switzer and other persons who were actively involved in obtaining this grant, and commended them in this effort.

3. A. Chair Lounsberry thanked Provost Marlin for her support and funding of faculty computer requests which will provide an additional resource to help faculty serve students better and pursue their research and publication/performance more efficiently.
- B. Chair Lounsberry reaffirmed Provost Marlin's request that all senators and faculty write or phone legislators asking for their support of UNI's special needs. She stated that Representative Bill Witt had indicated letters in the next two weeks were very crucial, particularly regarding enrollment enhancement.

Chair Lounsberry asked Registrar Philip Patton if he had information available on waiting lists for classes, to which Patton responded this information is sent to respective departments (Communication Studies, College of Business, etc.) and is not retained by the Registrar's Office.

- C. Chair Lounsberry indicated the Committee on Admission and Retention would be giving its annual report at the next Senate meeting, March 28.

- D. Chair Lounsberry thanked Senators and faculty who had attended the Faculty-to-Faculty Exchange on March 8 and thanked Myra Boots for preparing the food for this event. Chair Lounsberry indicated this second Faculty-to-Faculty exchange was not attended by as many faculty as the first one, but indicated those who did attend enjoyed the opportunity to exchange ideas.

Boots welcomed comments and ideas from colleagues on how this exchange could be better supported, such as a different day of the week, time, etc.

CALENDAR

4. 536 Request from Myra Boots that the Senate conduct an informal discussion concerning faculty and student adherence to examination week responsibilities for both groups. (Appendix A)

Boots moved, Primrose seconded to docket in regular order for the Senate meeting March 28. Motion carried. (Docket #468.)

5. 537 Motion from Senators Martin, Amend, Baum, and Brown that the University Faculty Senate form an ad hoc committee charged with examining issues related to the enhancement and maintenance of quality in the curriculum. (Appendix B)

Martin moved, Baum seconded to docket in regular order for the Senate meeting March 28. Motion carried. (Docket #469.)

6. 538 The ad hoc Committee on Exam Reform, appointed by the Senate Chair consisting of Senators Haack, Kueter, Primrose, and Assistant Vice President Richter, offered the following statement to the Senate for its consideration and adoption as university policy: "If regular course examinations are to be scheduled at a time other than when a class normally meets, the time and day of such examinations must be listed in the schedule of classes." (Appendix C)

DeNault moved, Gable seconded to docket in regular order for the Senate meeting March 28. Motion carried. (Docket #470.)

REPORTS

7. Chair Lounsberry introduced Professors Robert Kramer and Carmen Montecinos who had been charged with the responsibility of reviewing the evaluation instrument for the five-year evaluations of President Curris and Provost Marlin, and thanked them for returning to this meeting. At this time, Provost Marlin excused herself from the meeting.

Professor Kramer referred Senators to the evaluation instrument entitled "Faculty Assessment of the University President" which was sent in the February 28 Senate minutes, Appendix D. He stated President Curris had reviewed this evaluation instrument, which had been used for his first five-year evaluation, and had suggested no changes.

Professor Kramer then referred Senators to the evaluation instrument entitled "Faculty Assessment of the University Provost" which had been sent to all Senators March 9 (Appendix D). He stated Provost Marlin had reviewed this evaluation instrument, and he then distributed a revised page 4 which reflected a change made on the paragraph preceding the last four points, second sentence (Appendix E). This second sentence should now read: "Please rate how instrumental she has been in helping the University achieve the following goals:"

Senator DeNault asked Professors Kramer and Montecinos if there was or would be a preamble which would explain the process as to who would be assessing the President and Provost, who would be receiving the completed evaluation forms, who would tally these evaluation forms and how would they be tallied, who would receive the information after it

had been tallied, etc. DeNault also questioned the extent to which faculty comments had been solicited for these evaluation instruments.

Chair Lounsberry interjected in behalf of Kramer and Montecinos, stating the charge she had given to them was to examine the evaluation instruments, meet with President Curris and Provost Marlin to determine if they wished to add additional items, and make recommendations to the Faculty Senate regarding the optimum evaluation form--not canvass the faculty. The Chair stated, however, that in addition to having sent the evaluation instrument to department heads asking them to post it and seek faculty recommendations, and including the form in the Feb. 28 Senate minutes which go to all faculty, she had stressed in the January and February Senate minutes that faculty comments were invited. In response to who would be receiving results of these assessments, Chair Lounsberry stated the assessment of President Curris is mandated by the Board of Regents, and the faculty's assessment of the President would be sent to the nine Regents and the Board Office. She stated the faculty's assessment of Provost Marlin would be given to President Curris. The Chair added that it was her intent also to notify faculty of the results of each assessment in a one-page narrative summary. It was agreed by Senators to vote on the adoption of the evaluation instrument for President Curris first, and then Provost Marlin's.

Amend moved, Conklin seconded the adoption of the evaluation instrument to be used for faculty assessment of President Curris. It was the consensus of Senators to discuss any changes by section. Results of this voting are as follows: Evaluation Instrument for President Curris -- (see Appendix D)

General Administration

#12. "Is sensitive to the rights of women and minorities in the University."

DeNault moved, Baum seconded to change "women and minorities" to "all faculty." In the discussion which followed, opinions were expressed that affirmative action is a concern of the University and this question specifically addresses this University concern. Question was called on the motion. Motion was defeated.

Haack moved, Butler seconded to change "women and minorities" to "protected classes." Motion carried. #12 will read as follows:

"12. Is sensitive to the rights of protected classes in the University."

Leadership

DeNault moved, Haack seconded to add a number 15 to this section, which would read as follows:

"15. Has provided an environment that encourages and fosters mutual respect and understanding."

Motion carried.

Personnel Decisions and Relationships

It was agreed by Senators that no changes were needed in this section. Referring to the sections on "General Administration," "Leadership," and "Personnel Decisions and Relationships" in their entirety, Senator Martin moved, Brown seconded that the rating scale of this evaluation instrument be changed to reflect "1" as the lowest rating and "7" as the highest rating. Senator Martin stated the majority of people are more familiar with rating on this basis, and if not changed, the instrument may provide erroneous information. Motion carried. Robert Martin stated this rating change would be taken into account when tabulating

information so the President would be able to compare these results to his evaluation five years ago.

General Questions

2. What do you consider to be the President's major weaknesses, if any?

It was agreed by Senators by friendly amendment, to delete "if any" from this sentence.

Background Information of Evaluator

Martin moved, DeNault seconded to add "(optional)" at the end of the first sentence in this section. A short discussion followed in which senators questioned who the evaluation instrument would be sent to, whether information would be cross tabulated, and expressed concerns as to how anonymity and confidentiality would be protected. In response to distribution, Chair Lounsberry stated in the last five-year evaluation, the evaluation instruments were sent to only tenure and tenure track faculty. In response to tabulation, Robert Kramer stated in the last five-year evaluation, one confidential secretary tabulated returned evaluations, entered them into a computer, compiled faculty individual responses, and at the end of the process, evaluations were destroyed. He indicated there had been no cross tabulation done as pertains to colleges, gender, minority, length of service, etc. in the past. In conclusion, he stated neither he nor Montecinos would see the returned forms or their hand- or typewritten comments.

Question was called on the motion. Motion carried, and the first sentence will read as follows:

"In order to have a better understanding of the faculty participating in this assessment, we would appreciate your answering the following background information questions. (Optional)" DeNault moved that "the evaluation instrument be distributed to all faculty except those holding rank of Dean or above." Motion died for lack of a second.

DeNault moved, Kueter seconded to add a new #2 which would read as follows:

2. Principal responsibility:
 ___ Teaching
 ___ Administration
 ___ Other

Chair Lounsberry called for a division vote, at which time votes of 6 "yes", 4 "no", and 3 "abstentions" were cast. With this division vote, Chair Lounsberry ruled the motion carried. With the addition of this new #2, the previous numbers 2, 3, 4, and 5 will now become numbers 3, 4, 5, and 6 respectively.

Kueter moved, Conklin seconded that this evaluation instrument be distributed to all tenure and tenure track faculty for completion. Motion carried. As a matter of information, Chair Lounsberry stated this number would be approximately 600.

Haack moved, Baum seconded that the last page be submitted as separate data base information from the other pages of the instrument. In the discussion which followed, Senators expressed their concerns for protection of anonymity and confidentiality, but also expressed their sentiment that this type of background information could offer helpful feedback for the President if specific areas could be cross tabulated. It was restated, however, that since this section had been amended as "optional" it did not have to be returned at all.

Question was called on the motion. Chair Lounsberry called for a division vote, at which time votes of 5 "yes", 7 "no" were cast. With this division vote, Chair Lounsberry ruled the motion defeated.

Yadava moved, Conklin seconded to delete the old #4 (new #5, per DeNault/Kueter motion), and also change old #3 (new #4, per DeNault/Kueter motion) to read as follows: "1-5 years, 5-10 years, and greater than 10 years."

Martin moved, Kueter seconded to split the question. Motion carried.

Question was called on the Yadava/Conklin motion to change old #3 (new #4) as specified. DeNault made a friendly amendment to change to "fewer than 6, 6-10 years, more than 10 years," to which Yadava/Conklin agreed. Motion carried, with the new #4 to read as follows:

4. What is your length of service at UNI?

_____ fewer than 6 years
_____ 6-10 years
_____ more than 10 years

Question was called on the Yadava/Conklin motion to delete old #4 (new #5). Motion was defeated and question will remain.

DeNault asked to make a friendly amendment to new #5, and change the word "sex" to "gender". Senators agreed, and the new #5 will read as follows:

5. What is your gender? _____ Female _____ Male

Question was called on the motion to adopt the evaluation instrument to be used for faculty assessment of President Curris, as amended. Motion carried.

Evaluation Instrument for Provost Marlin -- (see Appendix D)

Butler moved, Primrose seconded to incorporate the amendments as approved for the evaluation instrument for President Curris into the evaluation instrument to be used for Provost Marlin. These approved amendments are as follows:

General Administration

12. Is sensitive to the rights of protected classes in the University.

Leadership

15. Has provided an environment that encourages and fosters mutual respect and understanding.

Referring to the sections "General Administration," "Leadership," "Personnel Decisions and Relationships," and the last 4 points on page 4, the rating scale of this evaluation instrument be changed to reflect "1" as the lowest rating and "7" as the highest rating.

General Questions

2. What do you consider to be the Provost's major weaknesses?

Page 4, Provost Marlin's comments (revised copy, as distributed at this meeting)

DeNault moved, Butler seconded to add the following sentence at the end of page 4, not as a new number 5, but over to left hand margin as a final sentence: "My perception is that Provost Marlin has been a positive influence on the academic program at UNI."

DeNault stated this would provide an opportunity for faculty to give an overall view. Motion carried.

Kueter moved, Primrose seconded to adopt the evaluation instrument for Provost Marlin, as amended. Motion carried.

DeNault moved, Conklin seconded to add the following sentence at the end of "General Questions" in President Curris' evaluation instrument, not as a new number, but over to left hand margin as a final sentence: "My perception is that President Curris has been a positive influence for the University." Motion carried.

It was agreed by Senators, Robert Kramer and Carmen Montecinos that President Curris' and Provost Marlin's evaluation instruments should be sent separately within a two-week time frame, with the evaluation instrument for President Curris being distributed first.

DeNault moved, Butler seconded that Faculty Senate Chair Lounsberry, Faculty Chair Myra Boots, and one additional faculty member chosen by Lounsberry and Boots compile the one- page summary reports of the evaluations of President Curris and Provost Marlin to be distributed in Fall 1994. Motion carried.

In conclusion, Chair Lounsberry reported a Faculty Senate forum was being organized to discuss grade inflation, and Senators would be hearing further details on a specific date and time.

DeNault moved, Primrose seconded that meeting be adjourned. Motion carried. Meeting adjourned at 5:30 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Diane Wallace
Secretary

These minutes shall stand approved as published unless corrections or protests are filed with the Secretary of the Senate within two weeks of this date, March 28, 1994.

GENERAL QUESTIONS

1. What do you consider to be the major strengths of the Provost?
2. What do you consider to be the Provost's major weaknesses, if any?
3. What suggestions do you have for improvement of the Provost's performance?

LEADERSHIP (continued)

	Yes +	No -
10. Understands well the diverse goals, methods and standards of the disciplines within the University.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 X	
11. Encourages faculty to be innovative and creative.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 X	
12. Keeps faculty apprised of administrative plans and actions.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 X	
13. Has my respect and confidence as an administrator.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 X	
14. Has positively influenced my level of morale.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 X	
Overall rating of performance as a leader.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 X	

PERSONAL DECISIONS AND RELATIONSHIPS

The Provost . . .

1. Develops and encourages open and easy communication with the faculty.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 X	
2. Is honest when dealing with faculty.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 X	
3. Is receptive to faculty suggestions and comments.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 X	
4. Uses faculty input in decision making.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 X	
5. Is receptive to varying viewpoints.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 X	
6. Is knowledgeable with respect to the professional activities of the faculty.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 X	

PERSONNEL DECISIONS AND RELATIONSHIPS (continued)

	Yes +	No -
7. Solicits opinions and input from all appropriate parties before making important decisions.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 X	
8. Is a positive factor in my decision to stay at UNI.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 X	
9. Is a positive force in helping faculty realize their academic potential.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 X	
10. Exercises good judgment in recruiting and hiring administrative staff.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 X	
11. Exercises good judgment in recruiting and hiring academic staff.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 X	
12. Plays an effective role in student recruitment and retention.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 X	
Overall rating of performance in personnel decisions and relationships.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 X	

When Dr. Marlin came to UNI, she identified four areas of priorities within the goals established in the University's Strategic Plan. Please rate the progress she has made in these four areas.

1. Implement the General Education program that was approved by the faculty in 1987.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 X	
2. Recruit quality faculty aggressively and competitively.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 X	
3. Enhance racial and cultural diversity within the University.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 X	
4. Enhance recognition of faculty and rewards for excellence in teaching, research, and service.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 X	

UNIVERSITY OF NORTHERN IOWA

Faculty Assessment of the University Provost

Directions: Please read each of the following items carefully and circle one of the eight possible ratings for each item. In responding, consider 1 a strong "yes" (the most positive rating), 4 an intermediate rating, and 7 a strong "no" (a very negative rating). If you do not have enough information to make a rating on a given item or the item does not apply to you, please circle the "X." You are invited to make comments on any of the items as well as add other comments as you wish.

GENERAL ADMINISTRATION

The Provost . . .	Yes +	No -
1. Is a hard and conscientious worker.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 X	
2. Exercises good financial management of University funds.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 X	
3. Is active in securing funding for the University.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 X	
4. Acts fairly in dealing with distribution of financial resources within the University	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 X	
5. Is responsive to faculty concerns.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 X	
6. Is sensitive to special department or college needs.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 X	
7. Is "on duty" and available.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 X	
8. Communicates clearly.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 X	
9. Demonstrates respect for faculty professional rights such as academic freedom.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 X	
10. Works effectively with other administrators.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 X	

GENERAL ADMINISTRATION (continued)

	Yes +	No -
11. Works effectively with the faculty.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 X	
12. Is sensitive to the rights of women and minorities in the University.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 X	
13. Is concerned with student needs.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 X	
Overall rating of performance in general administration.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 X	

LEADERSHIP

The Provost is . . .

1. Is a strong advocate for the University before the Regents.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 X
2. Is a strong advocate for the University before the Legislature.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 X
3. Maintains good relations with the local community and with the state in general.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 X
4. Maintains good relations with the alumni.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 X
5. Has an effective style of leadership.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 X
6. Articulates a comprehensive view of the mission of the University.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 X
7. Is an originator of ideas.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 X
8. Carries ideas and plans through to action.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 X
9. Implements policies with reason and judgment.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 X



To: Barbara Lounsberry, Chair, University Faculty Senate
 From: E. Richter, Chair ad hoc Committee on Exam Reform
 RE: Scheduling Exams
 Date: March 14, 1994

The committee, appointed by the Senate Chair consisting of senators Haack, Kueter, Primrose, and V.P. Richter, met and offers the following statement to the senate for its consideration and adoption for policy:

"If regular course examinations are to be scheduled at a time other than when a class normally meets, the time and day of such examinations must be listed in the schedule of classes".

TO: All Faculty Senators
 FROM: Barbara Lounsberry, Faculty Senate Chair
 Robert Kramer & Carmen Montecinos, Evaluation Instrument Committee
 DATE: March 9, 1994
 RE: Enclosed Proposed Evaluation Instrument for Provost Marlin

Professors Kramer & Montecinos were not able to complete this instrument until today. I hope this will give you sufficient time to study it for Monday's Senate meeting.

I look forward to your counsel, not only on this matter, but on the subject of a possible policy in respect to cancellation of classes and/or excusing of students in hazardous winter weather. We are scheduled to discuss this matter with the Provost Monday--so bring your best thoughts.

TO: Barbara Lounsberry
 FROM: Myra R. Boots
 DATE: March 3, 1994
 RE: Calendar Item for University Faculty Senate

Request that the senate conduct an informal discussion concerning faculty and student adherence to examination week responsibilities for both groups. The purpose of such a discussion would be to determine if examination week policies need to be changed, procedures put in place to insure adherence to the policies., or the extent of the problem with noncompliance is insufficient to cause concern. An appropriate motion might be formulated as a result of the informal discussion.

From: COBRA::MARTINK 9-MAR-1994 16:34:30.90
 To: LOUNSBERRY
 CC: AMEND, BAUM, BROWN, MARTINK
 Subject: Resolution for Senate Calendar

Barbara:

This is to request that you place the resolution which appears below on the calendar for the Senate meeting of March 14th. Thank you.

Kate Martin
 Library Faculty Senator

MOVED THAT: The University Faculty Senate form an ad hoc committee charged with examining issues related to the enhancement and maintenance of quality in the curriculum; to include, but not necessarily limited to, review of majors, program requirements, and the curriculum approval process. The committee will be expected to prepare a report to the Senate which will identify campus trends, problems, and issues of concern related to the curriculum, and to recommend appropriate policy or procedural changes or suggest how further investigation of these matters should be carried out. The committee would be expected to consult with the University Curriculum Committee, the General Education Committee, and the Strategic Planning Committee as it considers how the University's educational mission is, and should be, expressed in the curriculum.

The committee would consist of one faculty member from each of the colleges (including the Graduate College) and the Rod Library, and would be appointed by the Faculty Chair and the Faculty Senate Chair. The report of this committee would be expected by the end of the Fall 1994 semester in order that the report could be discussed and acted upon by the University Faculty Senate during the Spring 1995 semester.